

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

いかり

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE |                      | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/053,797                  | 01/18/2002           | Mark C. Myrhum       | 11739                | 11739 4271       |  |
| 36183 75                    | 90 03/05/2004        | EXAMINER             |                      |                  |  |
| PAUL, HAST                  | INGS, JANOFSKY & '   | BLAU, STEPH          | BLAU, STEPHEN LUTHER |                  |  |
| P.O. BOX 9190<br>SAN DIEGO. | 192<br>CA 92191-9092 | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER         |                  |  |
| Sinv Billoo,                | 0.1 ,2.,.,,,,,       |                      | 3711                 | 1.5              |  |

DATE MAILED: 03/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| <u> </u>  |   |   |                      |  | G |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|----------------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| À.Y.  | -   | Application No                            | ).                   | Applicant(s)                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary   |   | 10/053,797                                |                      | MYRHUM ET AL.                                  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |   | Examin r                                  |                      | Art Unit                                       |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |   | Stephen L. Blau                           |                      | 3711   |   |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply  |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1)⊠   | Responsive to communication(s) filed on   | _ ·                                       |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 2a) <u></u> ☐   | This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ Thi  | is action is non-                         | final.               |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| ` _   | ion of Claims   | 1   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | 4) Claim(s) 21-84 is/are pending in the application.  |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>21-84</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.   |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | Claim(s) is/are rejected.   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | Claim(s) is/are objected to.  | r alaction requir                         | om ont               |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers  | election require                          |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | The specification is objected to by the Examiner  | •   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.   |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).   |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.   |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120   |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).   |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).   |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.   |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 15)□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.   |   |   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment  |   | —   |                      |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 2) Notice   | e of References Cited (PTO-892)<br>e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)<br>nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | 4) <u> </u><br>5) <u> </u><br>6) <u> </u> | Notice of Informal F | (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO- |   |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/053,797 Page 2

Art Unit: 3711

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 21-60, drawn to a method of fitting a club to a player, classified in class 473, subclass 409.
  - II. Claims 61-84, drawn to golf club, classified in class 473, subclass 324.
- 2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions of a golf club and a method of fitting a club to a player are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process as fitting a club to a player without replacing the head but replacing the entire club.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

J

4. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Each group consists of species.

- a. If Group I claims (Claims 21-60) are elected the following species are claimed.
  - i. Species 1 (varying the thickness): Claims 43-52.
  - j. Species 2 (insert weight): Claims 53-60.
- b. If Group 2 claims (Claims 61-84) are elected the following species are claimed.
  - i. Species 1 (variable thickness): Claims 61-73.
  - j. Species 2 (insert weight): Claims 74-84.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for the group of claims elected for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Only group I claims currently have generic claims (Claims 21-42).

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims

Application/Control Number: 10/053,797

Art Unit: 3711

are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

5. A telephone call was not made to Mr. Gregory O. Garmong on 10 October 2003 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement due to the complexity of the restriction requirement.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

## Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steve Blau whose telephone number is (703) 308-2712. The examiner is available Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.. If the examiner is unavailable you can contact his supervisor Paul Sewell whose

Application/Control Number: 10/053,797

Art Unit: 3711

telephone number is (703) 308-2126. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858. (TC 3700 Official Fax 703-872-9306)

Slb/ 10 October 2003

STEPHEN BLAU PRIMARY EXAMINER Page 5